



## State of Connecticut

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

**REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH B. RITTER**  
THIRTY EIGHTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
ROOM 3004  
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591  
HOME: (860) 444-1700  
CAPITOL: (860) 240-8585  
TOLL FREE: 1-800-842-8267

E-mail: Elizabeth.Ritter@cga.ct.gov

**CHAIRMAN**  
PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

**MEMBER**  
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

TESTIMONY to the COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT  
SB 59 AN ACT PROHIBITING THE SALE OR USE OF FISHING SINKERS, JIGS AND TIRE WEIGHTS THAT  
CONTAIN LEAD  
January 31, 2011

Good afternoon Senator Meyers, Representative Roy, and members of the Committee on the Environment. I am Representative Elizabeth Ritter and I represent the 38<sup>th</sup> District. I am here on behalf of my constituents to voice my concerns for SB 59 AN ACT PROHIBITING THE SALE OR USE OF FISHING SINKERS, JIGS AND TIRE WEIGHTS THAT CONTAIN LEAD. I have heard from an unusual number of my constituents concerning this bill. I represent a shoreline district, and we are proud of the opportunities we provide for both commercial and recreational fishing.

Obviously the bill presents a cost impact to commercial fishers as well as a burden of time and trouble that is not needed in these difficult economic times. They will present far more detailed data than I, and I encourage you to listen closely. These are businesses already operating under difficult conditions and it does not serve any of us the state to

The group most unlikely to be heard in this conversation is the retired fishing community. I cannot state their concerns better than Mr. Arthur Harvey (4 Wyndwood Road, Uncasville, CT) did when he wrote me this weekend:

I will not be able to attend the public hearing however I wish to express my concern regarding my understanding of the impact SB 59 will have on the recreational fisherman if passed. The cost of refitting my tackle box with new weights and lures will definitely hurt my wallet and cause additional hardship relative to my ability to enjoy the only sport I can enjoy in my senior years. Of course I am concerned about the environment but I do not see the benefit in banning the use of lead in this activity as lead will have minimal effect on wildlife. Please reject this proposal.

It is my understanding that this proposal has been rejected in other states and by the federal government in the absence of compelling evidence that this is the way to remove the presence of lead from our waterways. Far better to go after the big contributors to the problem: lead pipes, lead in manufacturing, lead runoff, and lead deposited in our landfills and ash.

Thank you for your consideration.